REMARKS

In response to the final Office Action mailed on June 1, 2005, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of all rejections in the outstanding Office Action in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks. Claims 1-44 are currently pending. The Examiner has rejected claims 1-44 as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,185,567 to Ratnaraj *et al.* under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection as set forth in detail below.

I. Ratnaraj Fails to Disclose Searching Historic Financial Performance Data For Securities Underlying Structured Securities Transactions

Claim 1 recites "storing respective historical financial performance data for each of a plurality of securities, each security underlying one of a plurality of structured securities transactions sold by issuers to investors" and "receiving search criteria over the computer network from at least one of the users for identifying at least a subset of the historical financial performance data." Thus, claim 1 recites "receiving search criteria ... identifying ... historic financial data," where the historic financial performance data is for securities, "each security underlying one of a plurality of structured securities transactions." Ratnaraj completely fails to disclose this limitation.

Ratnaraj has absolutely no disclosure of structured securities transactions, let alone disclosure of searching for historic performance data for securities underlying such structured securities transactions. Ratnaraj simply fails to consider structured securities transactions at all. Ratnaraj does provide an extensive list of the types of financial data that it considers. *See* Ratnaraj, column 4, lines 33-63. Strikingly absent from Ratnaraj's list is any suggestion, consideration, discussion, or reference to any type of structured securities transaction whatsoever. Ratnaraj's failure to suggest, consider, discuss, or reference structured securities transaction is unsurprising. Indeed, Ratnaraj is directed authenticating access to a database containing generic financial data. The data that Ratnaraj chooses to include in his database is not particularly relevant to the present limitation.

The Examiner points to the Wharton Research Data System (WRDS) in the rejection. However, the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation in view of the WRDS. In particular, the Examiner has failed to establish that the WRDS includes any data

regarding structured securities transactions. Moreover, the Examiner has failed to point to any prior art that discloses searching historic financial performance data for securities underlying structured securities transactions. Ratnaraj and the WRDS simply fail to anticipate claim 1 and the claims dependent thereon.

The above-reference limitation is neither inherent in nor suggested by Ratnaraj. Indeed, there is no evidence that Ratnaraj or the WRDS includes any information at all on securities underlying structured securities transactions, let alone searching for the same. There are many ways of implementing Ratnaraj's invention that do not require "receiving search criteria ... identifying ... historic financial data," where the historic financial performance data is for securities, "each security underlying one of a plurality of structured securities transactions." There is not the slightest indication that Ratnaraj even considers this limitation. Further, there is no suggestion of this limitation in Ratnaraj or the WRDS. Even if the WRDS happens to contain data on a security that happens to underlie a structured transaction, and Applicants do no so concede, there is absolutely no evidence that Ratnaraj allows for dedicated searches of historic financial performance data for securities underlying structured securities transactions. Indeed, Ratnaraj's searching is completely generic. *See* Ratnaraj, column 7, lines 54-63. Accordingly, the limitation is neither taught, suggested, nor inherent in Ratnaraj or the WRDS.

Under 35 U.S.C. § 102, anticipation requires that a prior art reference disclose each and every element of the claimed invention. *In re* Sun, 31 USPQ2d 1451, 1453 (Fed. Cir. 1993) (unpublished). MPEP § 2131 reinforces this principle: "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Because the cited references fail to disclose receiving search criteria identifying historic financial performance data for securities underlying structured securities transactions, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1 and all claims dependent thereon be withdrawn.

II. Ratnaraj Fails To Disclose Storing Trustee Reports Including Data Defined By Indenture Documents For The Structured Securities Transactions

Claim 39 recites "storing respective trustee reports for each of the plurality of securities, the trustee reports including data defined by respective indenture documents for the structured securities transactions."

As discussed above, Ratnaraj fails to disclose any type of structured securities transaction. Similarly, Ratnaraj fails to disclose trustee reports. Ratnaraj also fails to disclose indenture documents. In the complete absence of disclosure of "structured security transactions," "trustee reports," or "indenture documents," Ratnaraj cannot possibly anticipate "storing respective trustee reports for each of the plurality of securities, the trustee reports including data defined by respective indenture documents for the structured securities transactions." Ratnaraj simply fails to meet this limitation.

As the Examiner is well aware, anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102 requires that a prior art reference disclose each and every element of the claimed invention. *In re* Sun, 31 USPQ2d 1451, 1453 (Fed. Cir. 1993) (unpublished). MPEP § 2131 reinforces this principle: "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Because the cited references fail to disclose storing trustee reports including data defined by indenture documents for the structured securities transactions, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 39 and all claims dependent thereon be withdrawn.

III. Ratnaraj Fails To Disclose Storing Indenture Documents For The Structured Securities Transaction

Claim 40 recites "storing respective indenture documents for the structured securities transaction," "receiving search criteria over the computer network ... identifying at least a subset of the indenture documents," and "retrieving the subset of indenture documents identified by the search criteria." Ratnaraj has absolutely no disclosure of these limitations.

Ratnaraj fails to disclose any type of structured securities transaction. Ratnaraj also fails to disclose indenture documents. In the complete absence of any disclosure of "structured security transactions" or "indenture documents," Ratnaraj cannot possibly anticipate "storing

respective indenture documents for the structured securities transaction," "receiving search criteria over the computer network ... identifying at least a subset of the indenture documents," and "retrieving the subset of indenture documents identified by the search criteria." Ratnaraj clearly fails to meet these limitations.

Under 35 U.S.C. § 102, anticipation requires that a prior art reference disclose each and every element of the claimed invention. *In re* Sun, 31 USPQ2d 1451, 1453 (Fed. Cir. 1993) (unpublished). MPEP § 2131 reinforces this principle: "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Because the cited references fail to disclose storing indenture documents for the structured securities transaction, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 40 and all claims dependent thereon be withdrawn.

IV. Ratnaraj Fails To Disclose Storing Contact Information Concerning Structured Securities Transactions

Claim 43 recites, "storing respective contact information concerning the structured securities transactions," "receiving search criteria ... identifying at least a some of the contact information," and "retrieving the contact information identified by the search criteria." Ratnaraj fails to disclose these limitations.

Ratnaraj does not disclose structured securities transactions. Ratnaraj does not disclose contact information relating to structured securities transactions. Ratnaraj does not disclose searching contact information associated with structured securities transactions. In the complete absence of any disclosure of "structured security transactions" or "contact information," Ratnaraj cannot possibly anticipate "storing respective contact information concerning the structured securities transactions," "receiving search criteria ... identifying at least a some of the contact information," and "retrieving the contact information identified by the search criteria." Ratnaraj simply does not meet these limitations.

Anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102 requires that a prior art reference disclose each and every element of the claimed invention. *In re* Sun, 31 USPQ2d 1451, 1453 (Fed. Cir. 1993) (unpublished). MPEP § 2131 reinforces this principle: "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a

single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Because the cited references fail to disclose storing contact information concerning structured securities transactions, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 43 and all claims dependent thereon be withdrawn.

V. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and an indication of the same is courteously solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone at the below listed telephone number, in order to expedite resolution of any issues and to expedite passage of the present application to issue, if any comments, questions, or suggestions arise in connection with the present application.

The fee associated with the one month extension for this Reply is contained in the attached check. Nevertheless, in the event that the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office requires a fee to enter this Reply or to maintain the present application pending, please charge such fee to the undersigned's Deposit Account No. 50-0206.

Respectfully submitted,
HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP

Dated: September 13, 2005

By: _____
Jeffrey Scott Leaming
Registration No. 51,184

Hunton & Williams LLP
Intellectual Property Department
1900 K Street, N.W., Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20006-1109
(202) 419-2092 (telephone)
(202) 778-2201 (facsimile)

JSL:mia